

REMARKS

Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of the present application in view of the foregoing amendments and in view of the reasons that follow.

Claim 1 is currently being amended.

This amendment adds, changes and/or deletes claims in this application. A detailed listing of all claims that are, or were, in the application, irrespective of whether the claim(s) remain under examination in the application, is presented, with an appropriate defined status identifier.

After amending the claims as set forth above, claims 1-25 remain pending in this application.

Claims 1, 3-6, 9, 12, 18-23 and 25 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as allegedly being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,597,318 to Parsche et al. (hereinafter “Parsche”). Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection for at least the following reasons.

Embodiments of the present invention are directed to antennas used for wireless communication which provide size reduction and performance improvement. According to certain embodiments of the invention, a capacitively coupled antenna is coupled to a substrate. The substrate is provided with a void, and a capacitive area of the antenna generally spans the void. Accordingly, claim 1 has been amended to recite “wherein.” Independent claims 3, 9 and 23 recite similar features.

In sharp contrast, Parsche fails to teach or suggest any such features. Parsche relates to a loop antenna and feed coupler. The devices disclosed in Parsche rely on a dielectric substrate having “differentially modified” regions which include meta-materials.. See Parsche, col. 6, lines 32-42. In forming the “differentially modified” regions, “features such as vias, voids, holes or cavities can be punched.” The vias are then filled with metal or other dielectric or magnetic materials. Thus, rather than having a capacitive area spanning a void, Parsche discloses using

meta-materials in the substrate to achieve its desired purpose. Nothing in Parsche teaches or suggests “a capacitive area of the antenna substantially spans the void.” Accordingly, Parsche does not anticipate claims 1, 3, 9 and 23.

As to independent claims 18 and 21, the Office Action fails to indicate where Parsche teaches or suggests the elements of those claims. Further, Applicant is unable to find any teaching or suggestion in Parsche of at least one element of each of claims 18 and 21. For example, with regards to claim 18, nowhere does Parsche teach or suggest “inductive means for creating an inductance.” Similarly, with regard to claim 21, Parsche fails to teach or suggest “coupling the third portion to the first portion and to the second portion to create an inductive area.” Thus, Parsche does not anticipate claims 18 and 21.

Therefore, independent claim 1, 3, 9, 18, 21 and 23 are patentable. Claims 4-6 depend from allowable claim 3 and are, therefore, patentable for at least that reason, as well as for additional patentable features when those claims are considered as a whole. Similarly, claim 12 depends from allowable claim 9, claims 19-20 depend from allowable claim 18, and claim 22 depends from allowable claim 21. Therefore, claims 12, 19-20 and 22 are patentable for at least that reason, as well as for additional patentable features when those claims are considered as a whole.

Claims 2, 13 and 16 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Parsche. Further, claims 7-8 and 10-11 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Parsche in view of U.S. Patent Publication No. 2004/0135726 A1 to Shamir et al. Further, claims 15, 17 and 24 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Parsche in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,281,854 to Ohaka et al. Applicant respectfully traverses these rejections for at least the following reasons.

Claim 2 depends from allowable claim 1 and is, therefore, patentable for at least that reason, as well as for additional patentable features when that claim is considered as a whole. Similarly, claims 7-8 depend from allowable claim 3, claims 10, 11, 13 and 15-17 depend from

allowable claim 9, and claim 24 depends from allowable claim 23. Therefore, claims 7-8, 10, 11, 13, 15-17 and 24 are patentable for at least that reason, as well as for additional patentable features when those claims are considered as a whole.

Applicant believes that the present application is now in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration of the application as amended is respectfully requested.

The Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned by telephone if it is felt that a telephone interview would advance the prosecution of the present application.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any additional fees which may be required regarding this application under 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.16-1.17, or credit any overpayment, to Deposit Account No. 50-0872. Should no proper payment be enclosed herewith, as by a check or credit card payment form being in the wrong amount, unsigned, post-dated, otherwise improper or informal or even entirely missing, the Commissioner is authorized to charge the unpaid amount to Deposit Account No. 50-0872. If any extensions of time are needed for timely acceptance of papers submitted herewith, Applicant hereby petitions for such extension under 37 C.F.R. §1.136 and authorizes payment of any such extensions fees to Deposit Account No. 50-0872.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: January 29, 2007

By /G. Peter Albert Jr./

FOLEY & LARDNER LLP
Customer Number: 30542
Telephone: (858) 847-6735
Facsimile: (858) 792-6773

G. Peter Albert Jr.
Attorney for Applicant
Registration No. 37,268